



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/088,541	03/19/2002	Gary S Simpson	124-928	6928

23117 7590 11/21/2007
NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC
901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR
ARLINGTON, VA 22203

EXAMINER

LANIER, BENJAMIN E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2132

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

11/21/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Application Number: 10/088,541
Filing Date: March 19, 2002
Appellant(s): SIMPSON ET AL.

MAILED

NOV 21 2007

Technology Center 2100

Stanley C. Spooner
Reg. No. 27,393
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 20 August 2007 appealing from the Office action mailed 31 January 2007.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

No amendment after final has been filed.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

5,696,898	BAKER	12-1997
5,859,966	HAYMAN	1-1999
6,289,462	MCNABB	9-2001
6,496,944	HSIAO	12-2002

Davis, "An Implementation of MLS on a Network Workstation using X.500/509", IEEE (May 2, 1997), pp. 546-553.

Harn, "ID-Based Cryptographic Schemes for User Identification, Digital Signatures, and Key Distribution, 5 June 1993, IEEE Journal on Selected areas in Communications, Vol. 11 No. 5. pp. 757-760.

Netscape Communications Corporation, Administrator's guide: Netscape Messaging Server Version 3.0, 1995, pp. 57-58.

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claims 1-5, 11-13, 17, 19-23, 29, 31, 32, 38, 41, 44 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baker (US Patent 5695898) and further in view of Davis et al. "An Implementation of MLS on a Network of Workstations Using X.500/509".

As per claim 1, Baker discloses a method for computer security to control access to data held on a computer system (columns 2,3 lines 66-3) as requestable datasets (see arguments above), said method comprising the steps of:

Allocating human users of a computer system between a plurality of user groups as members thereof, wherein not all user groups have only a single member and membership of a user group having multiple members is authentically evidenced by provision of user group identity information common to such members (column 4 line 65 – column 5 line 1, wherein the ID 207/208 is a single id that is common to users belonging to that user group), each user group corresponding to a respective dataset access category selected from a plurality of such categories such that all members of each user group having multiple members are associated with a dataset

access category which is common to members of that user group (column 4 lines 36-46, 53-56 and column 5 lines 10-12 and 37-43);

Providing for each dataset a dataset access category selected from said plurality of such categories and associated with a criterion for access to that dataset by computer system users (column 4 lines 47-49 and 53-56 wherein the criterion for access is whether the user id is listed in the database as having access to the dataset); and

Giving access to a dataset to a member of a user group with multiple members in response to such member providing authenticated evidence of membership of that user group and members of that user group being associated with a common dataset access category which enables access to that dataset (column 4 lines 36-46 and 53-56).

Baker does not specifically disclose wherein the evidence of membership of the user group is authenticated evidence. The evidence discussed in Baker is an identification code, however Baker doesn't discuss how the identification code is authenticated. The Examiner notes that it is extremely common and well known in the art for access control systems to implement some method of authenticating a user identity. It would be obvious for one to modify Baker such that it included a step for authenticating the user identity for determining access privileges. Motivation as commonly understood, would simply be to ensure that the user is who he/she says he/she is. Moreover, Davis discloses a database system wherein the user identity is authenticated.

Davis however, does disclose wherein the identification means comprises authenticated evidence as can be clearly seen with the use of certificates see page 553 under heading B. titled: *Access Server Model*.

Davis is analogous art because it discusses a computer security system very similar to Baker.

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Baker to include a method of authenticating the identity of the system users.

Motivation for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Baker as discussed above would have been to “provide a framework of authentication services by the directory to its users” (Davis, page 548 under heading B). It can be understood by one of ordinary skill that the Baker architecture when developed in the directory structure would clearly necessitate an enhanced form of security offered by the certificate system.

As per claim 2, Baker discloses a method according to Claim 1, wherein user groups and data access categories have hierarchical levels in which a higher dataset access category incorporates a or, as the case may be, each lower data access category, and the method includes allowing access to datasets by members of user groups associated with dataset access category levels equal to and higher than those to which such datasets correspond (column 5 lines 6-12).

As per claim 3, Baker discloses a method according to Claim 1, wherein each user is associated with a computer based identifying means and the method includes the step of determining a user’s identity from the identifying means (column 3 lines 54-56 and column 4 lines 36-39). Baker does not disclose wherein the identifying means is a certificate means. Davis does include wherein the identifying means comprises the use of X.509 certificates. See the rejection to claims 1 and 4.

As per claim 4, Baker discloses all of the features of Claim 3, but does not disclose the use of X.509 certificates as the computer based identifying certificate means.

Davis discloses using a X.509 certificate as an authentication means for use in a conditional network access architecture on page 553 under heading B. titled: *Access Server Model*.

Davis is analogous art because it discusses a computer security system very similar to Baker.

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Baker to include the use of X.509 certificates to identify the system users especially since Baker discusses using a tree structure format with directory and subdirectory listings and X.509 is the authentication framework for X.500 standard directories.

Motivation for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Baker as discussed above would have been to “provide a framework of authentication services by the directory to its users” (Davis, page 548 under heading B). It can be understood by one of ordinary skill that the Baker architecture when developed in the directory structure would clearly necessitate an enhanced form of security offered by the X.509 protocol.

As per claim 5, Baker discloses a method according to Claim 1, wherein datasets are web pages and the method includes the step of gaining access to the computer network via the Internet or the World-Wide-Web (column 2 line 3 – column 3 line 8).

As per claim 11, Baker discloses the data maintained on at least one database computer system (World Wide Web), and dataset access is given by access control software operated on a separate access control computer system (see Fig.1 block 112) and a user gains access to data by means of access request software running on a user computer system separate from the database and access control computer systems (see Fig. 1 blocks 107-109).

Baker does not explicitly state that the access control or the access request methods are on software, but one skilled in the art would clearly see that without explicitly saying software, the method that Baker discloses and implements must be run on and therefore inherently includes software at the user, access control, and database systems.

As per claim 12, Baker discloses a firewall at the access control system (see Fig. 1 block 113).

As per claim 13, Baker discloses the data is maintained on a plurality of database computer systems and in response to a data request, access control software determines whether or not corresponding data access is appropriate after relaying the request to a dataset computer system having such data (column 4 lines 7-15).

As per claim 17, Baker characterizes the step of giving access to a dataset includes unencrypted transfer of data from datasets to which access is granted (column 5 line 45; it is known to one of ordinary skill in the art that the http protocol includes unencrypted pages).

Claim 19 is rejected for disclosing the same subject matter as claim 1. One of ordinary skill in the art can clearly see that the method disclosed would inherently include a computer program so that it could be implemented.

Claim 20 is rejected for disclosing similar subject matter as claim 2.

Claim 21 is rejected for disclosing similar subject matter as claim 3.

Claim 22 is rejected for disclosing similar subject matter as claim 4.

Claim 23 is rejected for disclosing similar subject matter as claim 5.

Claim 29 is rejected for disclosing similar subject matter as claim 12.

Claim 31 is rejected for disclosing similar subject matter as claim 17.

Claim 32 is rejected for disclosing similar subject matter as claim 1, wherein the network access controller is found in Baker (Fig 1 number 112).

As per claim 38, Baker discloses a method for controlling user access to data held on a computer system as requestable datasets, the method including:

Labeling the datasets with dataset access labels defining a hierarchy of data access levels each associated with a criterion for access to a dataset by computer systems users,

Allocating human users of a computer system between a plurality of user groups as members thereof wherein not all user groups have only a single member and membership of a user group having multiple members is authentically evidenced by provision of user group identity information common to such members,

Labeling user groups with data access levels selected from said plurality thereof such that all members of each user group having multiple members are associated with a dataset access level which is common to members of that user group; and

Giving access to a requested dataset to a requesting member of a user group with multiple members in response to such member providing authenticated evidence of membership of that user group and members of that user group being labeled with a common data access level which in the hierarchy is equal to or above the dataset access level of the requesting dataset (see rejections to claims 1 and 2 wherein there is an implied labeling of the data set access categories as discussed in Baker).

Claim 41 is rejected under similar arguments as claims 32 and 38.

Claim 44 is rejected under similar arguments as applied to the rejections of claims 1 and

Claim 45 is rejected under similar arguments as applied to the rejections of claims 1-3.

Claims 6,24,39 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baker and Davis as applied to claim 3 above, and further in view of Hsiao et al. (US Patent 6496944).

As per claim 6, Baker discloses that the datasets are web pages, but does not disclose that the step of associating each dataset with a dataset access category comprises inserting meta tags in html web page code.

Hsiao discloses wherein meta data of a database entry comprises dataset access categories (column 5 lines 39 –42 wherein the security attributes and the access control list serve as the associating access information). Hsiao is directed to a method of assisting database system restore, which the Examiner acknowledges is not analogous art. However, the Examiner notes that it is well known and practiced in the art to associate meta data with tags on documents to be stored in a database system. Typically the meta data for documents contains information about the size, type, author, summary etc. Hsiao discloses that the meta data for documents can also include security parameters and access control lists. It would also be obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to see the parallels with meta tags on documents directed to access control in a database system and html meta tags to control access to pages on the Internet, thus making the argument analogous.

Motivation for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Baker to include associating the dataset access categories with meta tags in html web page code, would be the same as is used in the database systems wherein it is more efficient and practical to identify an access category in

the meta data of each entity, than to place all entities in category lists as would be well known by one of ordinary skill and as is practiced prevalently in the art.

Claim 24 is rejected because it is directed to similar subject matter as claim 6.

As per claim 39, Baker discloses a method according to claim 38 wherein the datasets are web pages with data access levels, and a proxy server is used to:

Receive requests for web pages from members of user groups,

Check user group data access levels against a prearranged access control list, and

Deny members of a user group access to requested web pages if they lack a data access level appearing on the access control list (column 3 lines 8-15).

Baker does not disclose wherein the labels are meta tags.

Hsiao discloses the use of meta tags as described above in the rejection for claim 6. The same argument holds for the rejection of claim 24.

Claim 42 is rejected because it discloses similar subject matter as claim 39.

Claims 7 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baker and Davis.

As per claim 7, Baker discloses the method of claim 1, but does not disclose the method further including the step of performing a challenge-response exchange regarding user identification before the step of giving access to a dataset.

Baker uses id codes to identify the user, but it is not discussed how the user is authenticated. The Examiner notes that challenge-response exchanges are extremely common and well known in the use of user authentication for a variety of systems.

Therefore it would be obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Baker to use a challenge-response identification scheme for authenticating the user.

Motivation for one to modify Baker would be to enhance the security of the identification step as would be understood by one of ordinary skill in the art. Most challenge-response methods use some sort of token or key to generate a unique response to a challenge, thus precluding one from having their credentials intercepted over the network and preventing a re-use attack on the system as is common understood in the art.

Claim 25 is rejected for disclosing similar subject matter as claim 7.

Claims 8,9, 26 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baker, Davis and further in view of Harn "ID-Based Cryptographic Schemes for User Identification, Digital Signature, and Key Distribution".

As per Claim 8, Baker discloses a method according to Claim 1 in which a user group member employs a user computer system to gain access to datasets to which access is controlled by an access control computer system, but does not disclose wherein that computer system has a public key for verifying signed data, wherein each user computer system incorporates a private key for signing data and user group identifying means, and the dataset access step includes:

Using the private key to sign test data provided by the access control computer system and forwarding the signed data and user group identity information provided by the identifying means to the access control computer system; and

Using the access control computer system to;

verify the user group identity information, verify the user by using the public key to verify the signed data, and determine user group and associated dataset access category from the user group identity information.

Harn discloses a scheme, wherein “user identification can be achieved directly through a challenge-response type procedure.” The steps of the scheme include using a private key to sign test data (wherein the data is a randomly selected odd number) provided by the access control computer system and forwarding the signed data and identifying means to the access control computer system; and using the access control computer system to verify the identifying means, verify the user by using the public key to verify the signed data, and determine user group and associated data access category from the identifying means (page 758). It would be obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to see that the user group and data access category information, while not explicitly stated, could be included in the identification data.

Harn is analogous art to Baker, as it pertains to authentication and identification schemes for identification in a network system.

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to modify Baker to include a more robust identification scheme using the public key authentication method, as public key cryptography is a widely known and used method of authenticating users to computer systems.

Motivation for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Baker as discussed above would be to “provide user identification and digital signature” and to establish a secure and secret communication session as taught in Harn (page 757) and as would be understood by one of ordinary skill in the art.

As per claim 9, Baker and Harn disclose claim 8 as discussed above, wherein Harn discloses the test data is random data (page 758).

Claim 26 is rejected for disclosing similar subject matter as claim 8.

Claim 27 is rejected for disclosing similar subject matter as claim 9.

Claims 10,28,34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baker and Davis as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of McNabb (US Patent 6,289,462).

Baker discloses the method of claim 1 while Davis discloses providing database access to a first kind of user having a user certificate for identification purposes.

Neither Baker nor Davis discloses granting database access to a second kind of user lacking a user certificate.

McNabb discloses allowing database access to unauthorized users as anonymous access (column 18 lines 5-7 lines and column 22 lines 44-46). While McNabb doesn't explicitly describe an authentication method using certificates, one of ordinary skill in the art could easily see that the authorization method in McNabb could be performed with user certificates.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Baker and Davis to include a step of authentication to a user lacking a user certificate.

McNabb is analogous art because it relates to a security method that grants access privileges based on security-level attributes, with a similar access control structure as discussed in Baker.

Motivation for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Baker/Davis to include access for users without certificates would be to allow access to public or non-sensitive data held on the database as implied in McNabb.

Claim 28 is rejected for disclosing similar subject matter as claim 10.

Claim 34 is rejected for disclosing similar subject matter as claim 10.

Claims 14-16, 30 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baker/Davis as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Hayman (US Patent 5,859,966).

As per claim 14, Baker discloses the method of claim 1, but does not disclose that the data access categories and the user groups and datasets with which they are associated are assigned numerical values.

Hayman does disclose that numerical values are assigned to the data access categories and the user groups and datasets with which they are assigned (column 8 line 16-18) and inherently explains the step of giving dataset access involves comparing user group and dataset numerical values to determine whether or not access is to be granted or denied. It is not an object of Hayman's invention to assign numerical numbers, but Hayman references mandatory access protocol (MAC) as described in the specification of the applicant wherein the MAC labels are stored as numeric values.

It would be obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Baker to include assigning numerical values to access categories.

Motivation for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Baker as discussed above would have been to simplify the categorization of data objects by assigning them access numbers instead of having to arrange access lists as could be easily deduced by one of ordinary skill in the art.

As per claim 15, Hayman discloses that the data access categories have different sections each with a section numerical value and the step of comparing numerical values comprises

comparing section numerical values of corresponding sections of user group and dataset numerical values (column 8 line 16-18 wherein the sections are referred to as categorical components).

As per claim 16, Hayman discloses that access to a dataset is provided only if all section comparisons are satisfied (column 8 39-45).

Claim 30 is rejected for disclosing similar subject matter as claim 14.

Claim 33 is rejected for disclosing similar same subject matter as claim 14.

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baker/Hayman as applied to claim 16 and further in view of Netscape (Netscape Messaging Server Version 3.0 Administrator's Guide, Netscape Communications Corporation, 1995 pages 57-58).

Baker and Hayman disclose the method according to claim 16 as discussed above.

Baker and Hayman do not disclose the step of running checking/blocking software on the user computer system to screen incoming data for encryption to block unwanted data content.

The Administrator's Guide discloses an SSL package that allows the user to configure a specific port to block encrypted data.

The Administrator's Guide is analogous art because it relates to how data is handled over a network and Baker discloses a network that as typically found in the art supports SSL for secure data transfer. Therefore it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Baker to include the blocking software, as this is a well-known feature in data networks.

Motivation for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Baker-Hayman to include blocking software would be to allow the user the ability to specify the level of encryption for receiving and managing data as taught in Netscape page 57.

Claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baker as applied to claim 19 and 32 above, and Davis as applied to claim 4. Wherein the computer network for database access is that which is shown in Baker, Fig.1.

Claim 36 is rejected under similar arguments as claim 6.

Claim 37 is rejected under similar arguments as claim 5.

Claims 40 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baker as applied to claims 1 and 2, Davis as applied to claim 4, and Harn as applied to claim 8.

As per claim 40, Baker discloses a method for controlling access to data held on a computer system as requestable web pages (claim 1), the method including:

Allocating human users of a computer system between a plurality of user groups as members thereof wherein not all user groups have only a single member and membership of a user group having multiple members is authentically evidenced by provision of user group identity information common to such members,

Labeling user groups with respective data access levels associated with member groupings and selected from said plurality thereof such that all members of each user group having multiple members are associated with a dataset access level which is common to members of that user group (claim 1),

Using a proxy server to:

Receive a request for a web page from a client computer system having web browser software and client proxy software and controlled by a requesting member of a user group, and

Give access to a requested web page to the requesting member if said requesting member is a member of a user group with multiple members in response to such member providing

authenticated evidence of membership of that user group and members of that user group being labeled with a common data access level in which the hierarchy is equal to or above the dataset access level of the requested web page (claim 2).

Baker does not disclose:

Labeling the web pages with meta tags defining a hierarchy of data access levels for an access control list providing a plurality of data access levels each associated with a criterion for access to a dataset by computer system users.

However, in view of claim 6 and claim 38, the examiner applies the same argument in deducing obviousness for one to apply meta tags with the security access level comprised therein to the datasets in Baker (see claims 6 and 38).

Baker does not disclose wherein each member has a key for signing data and a certificate indicating groupings to which that member belongs and wherein the proxy server:

sends data for signature to the client computer system and obtain the requesting member's certificate,

receives data from the client computer system,

verifies that the received data is:

signed with the requesting member's key,

a signed equivalent of the data sent to the requesting member for signature, and

signed with a key from a certificate which is not time expired or invalid, and

if the received data is verifies as aforesaid, check the data access level of the requesting member's user group against the access control list.

Harn and Davis combined do teach these limitation, wherein as applied in claim 4, Davis teaches the use of user certificates for gaining access and recognizing users in a multi-level security protocol and Harn as applied in claim 8, discusses the well known method of challenge response user authentication. The rejections to claims 4 and 8 are applied herein, and one of ordinary skill in the art would be able to see the motivation and obviousness of combining these methods with Baker, as Harn and Davis discuss common features in database access and access control systems. Motivation, as would easily be deduced by one of ordinary skill, is to increase the security and authentication stages by requiring user certificates and private keys for challenge response identification.

Claim 43 is rejected because it discloses similar subject matter to claim 40.

(10) Response to Argument

Appellant argues, "All of Appellants independent claims require the step or the interrelationship of 'allocating' human users between a plurality of user groups. This is not disclosed in the Baker reference." This argument is not persuasive because Baker discloses that a plurality of users have been placed in different classes (Col. 4, lines 47-51) for the purpose of delegating access control to data (Col. 4, lines 51-56 & Col. 5, lines 6-12). It is clear when Baker states (Col. 4, lines 48-49), "the invention could also be modified to recognize classes of users and/or user terminals," that **human** computer users are being discussed, and because these users have been classified into different classes, they have been effectively allocated into user groups as claimed.

Appellant argues, "The independent claims specify the allocating step is with respect to 'human users' and Baker fails to disclose this claimed feature... The reference to 'ID 207/208' in

Baker identifies two computer terminals in Figure 2...as far as meeting the claim requirement of allocating 'human users' there is no teaching as noted above." This argument is not persuasive, because as mentioned above, Baker discloses authentication of actual users and/or user terminals (Col. 4, lines 48-49).

Appellant argues, "Baker fails to disclose any identification of 'a data access category which is common to members of that user group'...Baker only discusses control of access to data either by restricting data which a terminal can access or by the user of a personal password unique to an individual and not by a dataset category being common to human members of a user group." This argument is not persuasive because Baker discloses that the relational database would include a listing of directory and/or subdirectory identifiers that a particular user or user group would be granted or denied access to (Col. 5, lines 10-12). This portion of Baker shows that the database includes an identification of a data access category that is common to members of a user group since the database identifies directories that are accessible by specific user groups.

Appellant admits that Baker discloses use of a personal password unique to an individual (i.e. human user) for authentication (See page 27 of Brief), but argues, "The Examiner attempts to recover from the admitted lack of teaching in Baker (and in Davis) by alleging that it is 'extremely common and well known in the art.' However, the Examiner provides no citation to support his contention which has been traversed by the appellant." This argument is not persuasive because the Examiner provided the requisite citations in the Final Office Action mailed 31 January 2007 in the last paragraph of page 4 to the first paragraph on page 5. Specifically, the Examiner has cited page 553 for the requisite teaching that meets the claim

limitation, and page 548 for the requisite motivation to combine the teachings of Davis with the teachings of Baker. Examiner wishes to note that the above mentioned citations of Davis are later addressed by the Appellant in the Brief (See pages 29-30), which is an acknowledgement by the Appellant that citations were in fact provided by the Examiner.

Appellant argues, "The Examiner has failed to meet his burden of proof by providing a 'reason' or 'motivation' for combining the Baker and Davis references...Without some motivation for combination, the Baker/Davis combination and rejections based thereon fail." This argument is not persuasive because the Examiner did provide a "reason/motivation" for the proposed combination in the Final Office Action mailed 31 January 2007, which is located in the third paragraph of page 5, which states "Motivation for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Baker as discussed above would have been to "provide a framework of authentication services by the directory to its users" (Davis, page 548 under heading B). It can be understood by one of ordinary skill that the Baker architecture when developed in the directory structure would clearly necessitate an enhanced form of security offered by the certificate system."

Appellant argues, "Mutual authentication may be what is disclosed in Davis, but this does not comprise any disclosure of the claimed 'membership of a user group [to be]...authentically evidenced." This argument is not persuasive because the claims require "providing authenticated evidence of membership of that user group" and Davis discloses (Page 553) a user requests access to an object by creating a request signed with her private key containing her name and the name of the object she wants to access, wherein upon receiving the request from the user, the access server retrieves the public key of the user to verify the identity of the user sending the

request. Therefore, the digitally signed request made by the user is effectively "authenticated evidence" since it authenticated and tied to the access rights of that user and the user group.

Appellant argues, "the cited portion of Davis merely teaches that the Davis certificate is authentication of one individual's identity and is not authentication of evidence of membership of a **user group** as required by Appellants' independent claims." This argument is not persuasive because Davis discloses that the verification data in the signed request is directly linked to the "userClass" which identifies the user groups allowed access to the restricted object (Page 553, Section B).

Appellant argues, "even if Baker, Davis and Hsiao were combined, they would not disclose the subject matter of claims 6, 24, 39, and 42." However, Appellant has failed to point out how Hsiao fails to meet the claim limitations. Hsiao discloses wherein meta data of a database entry comprises dataset access categories (column 5 lines 39 –42 wherein the security attributes and the access control list serve as the associating access information). Hsiao is directed to a method of assisting database system restore, which the Examiner acknowledges is not analogous art. However, the Examiner notes that it is well known and practiced in the art to associate meta data with tags on documents to be stored in a database system. Typically the meta data for documents contains information about the size, type, author, summary etc. Hsiao discloses that the meta data for documents can also include security parameters and access control lists. It would also be obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to see the parallels with meta tags on documents directed to access control in a database system and html meta tags to control access to pages on the Internet, thus making the argument analogous. Motivation for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Baker to include associating the dataset access categories

with meta tags in html web page code, would be the same as is used in the database systems wherein it is more efficient and practical to identify an access category in the meta data of each entity, than to place all entities in category lists as would be well known by one of ordinary skill and as is practiced prevalently in the art. Examiner wishes to note that Appellant has not addressed the cited teachings of Hsiao nor the motivation to modify Baker with the teachings of Hsiao.


The remainder of Appellant's arguments rely on previous arguments that have been fully addressed above.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix


No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,


Benjamin E. Lanier
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2132

Conferees:


Gilberto Barron
SPE
Art Unit 2132

/Christian LaForgia/
Christian Laforgia
Examiner Art Unit 2131